

The restriction requirement is based on the allegation that "Claim 11, at least, is anticipated by or obvious over U.S. 4,339,371." However, Examiner has not rejected Claim 11 as being anticipated or obvious. Accordingly, Applicants have not had an opportunity to address this hypothetical rejection with the Examiner. The issue of novelty/obviousness is thus not yet decided. Therefore, Applicants submit that Examiners rationale is based on an unsettled issue, not a fact, and thus the requirement for restriction should be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Applicants further submit that the issue of unity of invention was decided by the International Preliminary Examining Authority and was found to be present.

Claims of the present application have unity of invention under 37 CFR 1.475(b)(3).

Applicants direct Examiner's attention to the decision in Caterpillar Tractor Co. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, 237 USPQ 590 (U.S. D. Ct., E. D. Virginia, 1986).

Applicants provisionally elect Group I with transverse.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul D. Hayhurst
Registration No. 30,180
Phone: 989 636-9373

P. O. Box 1967
Midland, MI 48641-1967